

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 14, and 27, and cancelled claims 4, 17, and 30. Therefore, upon entry of this Amendment, claims 1-3, 5-16, 18-29, and 31-40 are all the claims pending in the application. In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims define patentable subject matter.

As a preliminary matter, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended to Applicant's representative in the personal interview conducted on May 30, 2007.

**I. Statement of Substance of Interview**

During the interview, the Examiner and Applicant's representative discussed at length the feature "translating the voice data to text using a voice print", as recited in dependent claim 4. Specifically, Applicant submitted that there is simply no teaching or suggestion in Devinney (or any of the other cited references) that voice data is translated to text by using a voice print. Applicant then suggested amending claim 4 to read "translating the voice data to text using a voice print, wherein the translated text may be returned to the device". The Examiner indicated that this limitation would be considered upon receipt of Applicant's response.

**II. Overview of the Office Action**

Claims 1-3, 6, 8-10, 14-19, 22, 24-26, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Hedin (U.S. Patent No. 6,185,535). Claims 3, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin in view of Alpdemir (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,389). Claims 4, 17, and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin in view of Alpdemir and further in view of Devinney, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0046083). Claims 6, 19, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Hedin. Claims 10-13, 23-26, and 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hedin in of King (U.S. Patent No. 6,532,446).

### **III. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Examiner asserts that claim 40 introduces new subject matter into the specification. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended claim 40 in order to improve clarity. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to remove the § 112 rejection.

### **IV. Prior Art Rejections**

Amended independent claim 1 and analogous independent claims 14 and 27 recite in part:

receiving voice data and a device identifier from the device;

translating the voice data to text;

determining whether to filter the translated text; and

if it is determined that the translated text is to be filtered, applying a filter to the translated text;

wherein the voice data is translated to text using a voice print, and the translated text is returned to the device.

In the Office Action dated April 25, 2007, the Examiner acknowledged that Hedin and Alpdemir do not disclose the feature “translating the voice data to text using a voice print” as recited in previous claim 4. The Examiner thus relied on Devinney to cure this conceded deficiency, and cited paragraphs [0015] and [0018] of Devinney as allegedly disclosing this feature of the claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s position.

Devinney discloses a system for increasing the security of financial transactions (paragraph [0015]), wherein a voice print and speaker recognition technology are used to validate a transaction and identify a user (paragraph [0015]).

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Devinney of translating voice data to text using a voice print as required by independent claims 1, 14, and 27. Devinney merely discloses a speaker verification system which determines whether a speech sample provides a sufficient match to a claimed identity. The speech sample may be text dependent, where the speaker is identified by the utterance of a password (paragraph [0018]), or text-independent, where the speaker verification system does not use predefined password phrases.

However, there is simply no teaching or suggestion in Devinney that voice data is translated to text by use of a voice print as required by the claims.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 14, and 27 should be allowable, because the cited references do not teach or suggest all of the features of the claim. Claims 2, 3, 5-13, 15, 16, 18-26, 28, 29, and 31-40 should also be allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on independent claims 1, 14, and 27.


In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116  
U.S. Patent Application No.: 09/690,313

Attorney Docket No.: A8504  
STL920000052US1

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark E. Wallerson  
Registration No. 59,043

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

**46159**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: June 15, 2007